



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

10

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/415,966 10/12/99 BENNER

S SUL-402D1

023557 HM12/0329  
SALIWANCHIK LLOYD & SALIWANCHIK  
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION  
2421 N.W. 41ST STREET  
SUITE A-1  
GAINESVILLE FL 32606-6669

EXAMINER

ARTHUR, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

4

DATE MAILED: 03/29/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/415,966

Applicant(s)

Brenner

Examiner

Lisa Athur

Group Art Unit  
1655



Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1655

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 3,4, 7 and 9 are not supported by the specification because the specification does not teach the particularly recited compounds. These compounds do not appear to be described in the specification and do not appear to be embodiments from the broadly drawn claims 1 and 5. Therefore, these claims appear to introduce new matter into the specification.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 9 is not supported by the specification because the specification contains no description of method for an improved method of making a catalyst for a preselected reaction wherein an organic cofactor with an organic function group is included which has affinity for an oligonucleotide. The specification contains no description of such a method nor of organic

Art Unit: 1655

cofactors which have affinity for oligonucleotides. This concept has not previously need described and consequently introduces new matter into this application.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is indefinite over the recitation of "the improvement comprises including during step b an organic cofactor carrying an organic functional group with affinity for oligonucleotide" because this phrase does not make sense grammatically or with regard to the claimed method. That is the claim is unclear as to what an organic cofactor is referring to, i.e. is this cofactor part of the oligonucleotide or a separate compound, for example.

6. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.


Art Unit: 1655

7. Claims 1,2,5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, 7, 8 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,965,364. This is a double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Arthur whose telephone number is (703) 308-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jones, can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

  
**LISA B. ARTHUR**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 1800-1600**

March 26, 2001